Harry Garretsen has stepped down as FEB’s dean on May 1st. He looks back with satisfaction on what has been achieved in the past few years and welcomes new initiatives.

The Rosalind Franklin Programme attracts the best researchers from all over the world to perform research in their field. Read more about the programme and our fellows.

FEB’s Research Institute SOM has been evaluated very positively in the national Research Review Economics & Business, that was published this spring. FEB takes a number 1 position in the Netherlands, together with the VU Amsterdam. Especially the societal relevance of research conducted at FEB scores very high. According to the peer review committee “it meets world-class standards”.

On the cover: Raquel Ortega-Argilés, Susanne Täuber and Jing Wan
New in Groningen: Hille Bruns
Cosmopolitan researcher Hille Bruns travelled to Groningen via Berlin, Amsterdam and Boston.

VICI grant for Bernard Nijstad
Creativity is vital to organizational success and economic growth, says FEB researcher Bernard Nijstad. He received a VICI grant for his research on creativity.

According to the Dutch Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) the academic quality, societal relevance and viability of research conducted by SOM researchers at FEB were assessed on a scale of 1 to 4. SOM’s scores are:

**Quality:** 2 (very good)
**Societal Relevance:** 1 (excellent)
**Viability:** 2 (very good)

**Quality**
Overall, the committee believes the research in economics and business administration in the Netherlands to be of high quality (which merits a rating of ‘very good’ for all participating institutes). According to the report, SOM conducts very good, internationally recognised research. The committee says: “Although not a full service business school (e.g., it does not currently offer an MBA programme), it has greater breadth than some other units in this assessment, befitting a full range business school.” FEB is praised for acquiring AACSB and EQUIS accreditation, which is seen as a credit to its leadership and likely to provide long-term benefits in developing international links, learning best practices and the internationalisation of the school.

**Relevance**
An exceptional feature of SOM’s high-quality academic output is its societal relevance, states the report: “A particular strength is its ability to blend high quality research in many areas with societal relevance that manifests itself in many ways. This is the result of a strategic vision and professionalism that imbues the organisation.” Furthermore the committee notes that SOM has clear policies and structures to enhance the societal relevance of its research and that these are well integrated in the unit’s operation to go beyond being policy measures.

**Viability**
The committee finds that SOM appears viable and robust, with a sound strategy for its future development. “The exceptionally good management of SOM enhances its ability to continue its successful development.” Also the excellent facilities, like the experimental research lab, the library, and the availability of relevant databases are highly appreciated.

**PhD programme**
The committee notes a number of strengths of the PhD programme, mainly with regard to the rigorous admission procedures. Like elsewhere, there is a clear benefit for all concerned in linking the large research masters that combines economics and business to the PhD programme to shorten the total time for PhD completion. Furthermore, the PhD programme is praised for the excellent supervision of candidates. The committee concludes that the SOM Research Institute is very well equipped for the future.

rug.nl/research/som-ri
Harry Garretsen: Taking stock and looking ahead
Harry Garretsen has stepped down as FEB’s dean on May 1st. He looks back with satisfaction on what has been achieved in the past few years and welcomes new initiatives like the recently selected signature areas. “We can feel quite confident about the near future for our research.”

"On September 25th last year, the SOM board and a delegation of FEB researchers went to Utrecht to be interviewed by the review committee as part of the national Research Review Economics & Business 2008-2014. Headed by the well-known econometrician Professor Arie Kapteyn, the committee grilled us for one full day on the quality of our research and research policies. On our way back to Groningen, the general feeling on the ‘group-app’ was that, all things considered, we probably did alright. But even with this initial optimism in mind, the report and final scores which were published at the beginning of 2016 turned out to be a (very pleasant!) surprise. For the three indicators "quality, viability, and societal relevance" the SOM research programme got 2-2-1 marks; that is to say, very good-very good-excellent scores respectively. The highest mark on offer for societal relevance is particularly pleasing. Benchmarking these scores against the other programmes that took part in the review also shows that we did very well. Rankings like this should not be taken too seriously, but together with the VU University Amsterdam we got the highest marks.

Remarkable turn-around

More generally, the report by the review committee also compares the research in economics and business to the rest of Europe and here too the Dutch universities perform really well: just outside but close to the European top-10 is the bottom line. For those of us who can still remember the strong criticism that Dutch research received by international review committees not that long ago, this is a remarkable turn-around.

Room for improvement

So far, so good. With such a rosy research assessment under our belt it is tempting to just continue along the same lines in the next seven years: never change etc. But this would be a mistake. First of all, the review committee points out a number of areas where they see room for improvement for our own research. They recommend to strengthen our alumni relations to the benefit of our research, to encourage our PhDs to spend some time outside the Netherlands, to put more effort into recruiting and, finally, to invest more in external relations by for instance bringing in more visiting researchers. Investments by SOM and FEB into all these four areas are in the making. Moreover, and actually preceding the review assessment, it was decided that a further strengthening of our research productivity and quality would mainly have to come from the researchers themselves by tapping into new research areas and activities in a "bottom up" manner. In the summer of last year, a call for so called signature areas went out where researchers were asked to come up with ideas for new research groups and themes. These signature areas cut across traditional disciplinary lines and serve a dual purpose. Internally, they offer the opportunity to explore new research questions by building on proven track records of our best researchers. Externally, they increase the visibility of our research and make it easier to communicate those areas where we really excel. The call for the signature areas was a resounding success and recently seven of these areas have been selected.

Stimulating research environment

Backed by these new initiatives and the investment funds to support them, we can feel quite confident about the near future for our research. Helped also by the increasingly successful attempts of our researchers to acquire external funding, SOM is well-positioned to indeed stay a top-research institute within Europe. This is no small feat since competition for research talent is already fierce and will only get stronger over time with universities in- and, especially, outside Europe outbidding us in the attempt to hire excellent academic staff. The answer to this development is not to try to match those salaries and other financial perks (we simply cannot), but to continue to offer a stimulating research environment, one that leads to those very good scores that were handed out by the committee Kapteyn.

‘It would be a mistake to just continue along the same lines’

Finally and by way of goodbye, I had the pleasure to be strongly involved with our research and SOM during my term as dean from March 2011 to May 2016. Herman de Jong will succeed me as dean from September onwards. I shall "return" to my chair of professor of International Economics & Business and, together with Janka Stoker, I am in the midst of setting up a new research center on leadership, management and economics called In the LEAD. In doing so, I can, once again, fully concentrate on doing research myself, which beats talking and writing about other people’s research down”.

rug.nl/staff/j.h.garretsen
To promote the advancement of talented international researchers at the highest levels of the institution, the University of Groningen started the prestigious Rosalind Franklin Fellowship programme. The programme is co-funded by the European Union and primarily directed at women who have a PhD and aim for a career towards full professorship at a European top research university. Janka Stoker, who is a member of the committee that proposes candidates to the Faculty Board on behalf of FEB, praises the first Fellows at the Faculty. In addition, the current Fellows Raquel Ortega-Argilés, Susanne Täuber and Jing Wan present their research topics and ideal research outcomes.

Staff of the highest quality
The Rosalind Franklin Fellowship (RFF) programme is of the utmost importance, says Janka Stoker. "Having ascertained that we have too few women professors at the University of Groningen, it is essential that we create extra opportunities for female talent. As these are extra positions, men are not disadvantaged. In addition, the women who are selected are exceptionally talented, so this is a good way for our university to recruit staff of the highest quality."

Successful programme
The success of the first generation of Rosalind Franklin Fellows endorses the selection of the proposal committee in 2007, made despite some confusion about the selection criteria within the university-wide RFF committee. "When the programme was launched, candidates from all faculties had to satisfy an admission requirement stating that they must have worked for at least three years after being awarded a PhD."

In the spotlight
Talented academics certainly applies to Floor Rink and Laura Spierdijk, the first Rosalind Franklin Fellows to be appointed at FEB back in 2007. Stoker: "Of course you hope that the Rosalind Franklin Fellows will develop into real role models. The committee makes its selection on the basis of candidates' potential, just as we do for 'regular' tenure track positions. You then have to wait and see what happens. Luckily, the first generation has more than fulfilled its promise. Floor and Laura completed the faculty tenure track and were recently appointed as full professors. To our utter delight, first Laura, and now Floor, were awarded Vidi grants. It makes me so proud. And of course I'm pleased for the professors themselves too. Being appointed as a Rosalind Franklin Fellow is obviously a wonderful career opportunity for young researchers, but it also puts them in the spotlight. People are watching you all the time, and not through your own doing. So it's always that little bit more special when Fellows achieve success."

‘Rosalind Franklin Fellows are great role models’
"This is fairly normal practice in the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, for example", explains Stoker. "But in the field of Economics and Business, there's a good chance that the most talented researchers will have found a great job elsewhere in that time, and will not be keen to leave. Luckily, the committee at the time managed to convince people that this requirement would possibly prevent our Faculty from attracting top-class talent. The admission requirement has been redefined over the years, and now takes account of faculty differences in this respect. This has certainly proved effective for our faculty."
Raquel Ortega-Argilés
Assistant Professor Global Economics and Management

Research topics
“I am an economist specialised in applied econometric techniques with advanced methodological skills in quantitative methods. I also have extensive experience of case study and qualitative research techniques, and in particular in research relating to firm and regional innovation policy issues. My major research interests relate to productivity, innovation, entrepreneurship, firm dynamics, small firms and also economic geography. The types of questions my research responds to are: Why do similar locations have different economic performance? What determines differences in regional entrepreneurship rates? Is research and innovation the explanation for differences in productivity within European regions? What types of policies are better suited for certain types of locations? Is R&D relevant for small and medium enterprises? What types of ownership structures determine higher innovative outcomes? What are the most appropriate settings for modern regional policy in the current context?”

Societal issues
“My research considers that locations (cities or regions) are eco-systems that evolve, grow or degenerate due to individual conditions based on their own history, industrial heritage, macroeconomic conditions, and political and institutional changes. The place based holistic approach of my research aims to address a range of different societal challenges including unemployment, brain drain, skill mismatches, income inequality, ageing and depopulation.”

Ideal research outcome
“I have worked in different environments and in different capacities across a broad set of applied economic and business research topics, in both universities and prestigious national and international research institutes. During recent years, my research work has been targeted at publishing applied economic research in top scientific journals and peer-reviewed books as well as in providing research-based policy advice to various European Commission Directorates, the OECD, to the European Investment Bank, along with national and regional government departments in various countries. The ideal outcome of my research would be to be able to contribute to high level policy debates on the basis of my academic research and my quantitative and qualitative scientific analyses.”

Raquel Ortega-Argilés

Susanne Täuber
Susanne Täuber  
Associate Professor HRM&OB

Research topics  
“I have always been fascinated by inaction. Common explanations for people’s refusal to act while this is expected from them revolve around either hostile or paternalistic stereotypes – they are depicted as lazy, indifferent, apathetic, or childish. But together with my collaborators, I could show that it is particularly the threat to their morality which pushes people and groups of people into defensiveness. They refuse to change their lifestyle, to mitigate climate change, to improve national immigration policies, and so on. And, intriguingly, they want to make a statement by not acting, namely that they do not agree with their status as “morally bad” people. Thus, we could show that inaction can be a motivated and strategic response to perceived moral threats. I think as scientists and as citizens we should investigate these responses more intensely, given the severe impediments that inaction can cause for societal progress and cohesion.”

Societal issues  
“The participation society entails a strong risk of dividing the population in morally good (healthy weight, white teeth) and morally bad (overweight, bad teeth) citizens. Intriguingly, the most defensive responses to moral appeals come from those who are most unhealthy, while moral appeals are most enthusiastically embraced by those who already live healthily. But health, with its strong links to socioeconomic status, is unequally distributed in society. Therefore, moral appeals have the potential to increase instead of decrease the existing social inequalities regarding health. Our society is increasingly offloading responsibility – and in consequence, blame – on the shoulders of its most vulnerable citizens. This is detrimental to reaching the goal of inclusive, sustainable, and healthy societies.”

Ideal research outcome  
“My research focuses on the motivational power of moral appeals. Contrary to what many people intuitively think, appealing to someone's morality in order to persuade them often elicits defensiveness rather than motivating them to change their behavior. Defensiveness essentially means inaction where there is an expectation of action. This can cause severe societal problems, as for instance regarding the participation society. The government tries to persuade citizens to live more healthily. They emphasize that being healthy is citizens' own responsibility, and that they harm society through health care costs by being unhealthy. The two elements of responsibility and harm make the appeal moral – and increase the risk that the persuasive message backfires by pushing people into defensiveness. Therefore, the ideal outcomes of my research would be first to thoroughly understand the effects of moral motivation on behavior change and the underlying processes to these effects, and second to find alternative ways to persuade people which circumvent defensiveness.”

Jing Wan  
Assistant Professor Marketing

Research topics  
“I am interested in the moral decision making process of individuals. More specifically, my research examines factors that influence people to behave morally or immorally and how they deal with the emotions that arise from having engaged in such moral or immoral behaviors. As a marketing scholar, I examine these issues from a consumption context, and the types of questions I ask in my research include: How do consumers cope with guilt resulting from their own transgressions? How do the products that consumers choose to buy influence their future ethical behaviors? How can we encourage consumers to choose more ethical options?”

Societal issues  
“My research focuses on "small" moral and immoral decisions, like choosing to help a friend or to cheat on an exam or deciding to buy free-range vs. battery cage eggs. The reason I focus particularly on these types of behaviors is that we, as individuals, have to make these decisions on a day-to-day basis and the outcomes of these decisions are consequential at a broader, societal level. Choosing the more ethical option rather than the more tempting option is not always easy, especially since we are constantly faced with these choices and we are good at rationalizing our behaviors. Having a thorough understanding of how we make these decisions can help policy makers and other interested parties developing techniques to encourage individuals to engage in more ethical and pro-social behaviors.”

Ideal research outcome  
“At a theoretical level, the results of my research would provide us with a deeper understanding of what drives us to make these day-to-day moral (or immoral) decisions, and would ideally allow us to predict the circumstances under which someone would choose to be ethical (or not). From a practical perspective, my research would lead to the development of effective methods to help individuals make decisions that improve their own well-being and the well-being of others.”
Key publications:


Hille Bruns joined FEB in the fall of 2015. She lived in Berlin, Amsterdam and Boston and now is a tenure track researcher in the research programme Innovation & Organization.

Career so far
“I am a cosmopolitan qualitative researcher. German by origin, I received undergraduate diplomas in Anthropology and Philosophy in Berlin, my Master in Social Sciences in Amsterdam, and my doctorate in Organizational Behavior in Boston. My entire career has been devoted to understanding how people work together who come from different backgrounds. For my Master thesis, I followed a modern religious group. Everyone believed in something different, but the group regularly came together to practice rituals, which fascinated me. Next, as project manager at the Dutch NGO ‘De Wijk is van Ons Allemaal’, I helped organize committees of residents and local professionals to improve the quality of life. Our projects focused on multicultural neighborhoods in Amsterdam, so people had diverse ethnic backgrounds. At this point I decided that a work environment would more clearly reflect the process dynamics I was interested in. For my doctorate, I won a scholarship at the Boston University School of Management. My fieldwork at the center for Systems Biology at the Harvard Medical School and MIT investigated cross-disciplinary cancer research. For a year and a half, I studied biologists and computer scientists, who in turn studied mice and mathematical models. Finally, I was able to isolate the dynamics of group processes into three temporal dimensions. Processes are a very important phenomenon in organizations, but the measures we have to date are very crude and do not capture the temporal nature of process. Processes around routine work look very different from those that lead to innovation. I believe that this angle adds unique value to the Department of Innovation Management and Strategy.”

Plans for the future
“What I would like to do next is to test my model of group process, through a simulation for example. I joined the FEB because there is interesting research ongoing on similar topics, but from a quantitative perspective. Gerben van der Vegt, for example, studies the problem of coordination in diverse groups. So I work in collaboration with scholars who approach these issues with a quantitative mindset. This is relevant to our society because people are increasingly specialized, and at the same time teamwork is becoming more important. Of course, then we need to understand how diversely specialized people work together in teams, and what the group processes look like. I believe that the issue of specialization is absolutely crucial in where we are heading as a society. My future plans are to write a book on this subject, and to open a research center to build a community of like-minded scholars interested in process research.”
A mind for creativity:
Bernard Nijstad

rug.nl/staff/b.a.nijstad
Creativity has let humans launch spaceships to explore Mars, type our papers on laptop computers and get medical treatments that actually work. This human capacity for creativity lets employees in organizations solve day-to-day problems and develop ideas for new products or services. As such, creativity is vital to organizational success and economic growth.

But how do people come up with creative ideas, and how can creativity within organizations best be managed? And how can one make sure that creative ideas are actually used to create profitable innovation? We talk to Bernard Nijstad who was recently awarded a prestigious Vici grant by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) to study these questions.

What motivates this research project?
“I have studied human creativity ever since I was a PhD student, when I wrote my thesis about brainstorming groups. What fascinates me about creativity is that it involves the creation of something that was not there before. Anybody who has ever generated something even moderately creative knows that this can be a magical feeling. Yet, creativity is not something magical or mystical; in fact, every human being is creative. Creativity, in my view, is a natural consequence of the way our brains work.

Creativity can be defined as the generation of new and useful ideas. Because creativity is so important for our survival, for organizational growth, and for societal development, it is widely studied in different areas of science. This certainly is true in my area of study, organizational behavior, where studying the creativity of employees or teams is currently a hot topic. However, I was dissatisfied with the state-of-the-science, for two main reasons.

The first reason is that the field lacks an integrative theory. This means that there are many scattered findings, that sometimes seem inconsistent, and many mini-theories that do little in terms of creating a good understanding of creativity in organizations. For example, the field is dominated by what I would like to call the “positive psychology” approach to employee creativity. According to this approach, creativity results if employees are given autonomy, challenging (but not stressful) work, and are provided with sufficient resources and support. These conditions should trigger intrinsic motivation, which supposedly is required for creativity to emerge. Yet, this view is seriously challenged by other research showing that putting employees under pressure, extrinsically motivating them through rewards, and that even job dissatisfaction and negative mood states can lead to creativity. How can these seemingly diverging results be reconciled and integrated within one theoretical framework?

The second reason is that the work on employee and team creativity is disconnected from an equally large body of research on organizational innovation. Although I usually start my papers with the observation that creativity is important for innovation, we know surprisingly little about the relation between creativity and innovation. Indeed, not all creative ideas eventually result in the introduction of a new product or service to the market, and many ideas die a silent death. For example, we know very little about the circumstances in which employee or team creativity is related to organizational innovation. Do organizations just have to invest in Research and Development (R&D) activities, or is it useful to stimulate creativity throughout the organization?”

What will the research consist of?
“The main aim of the Vici project is to develop an integrative multi-level theory of employee creativity. As such, it is a theory development exercise. However, in my experience, it helps to have good data to develop theory: theoretical insights often emerge out of the patterns in the data. The theory that I have in mind will have two key characteristics. The first is that it will connect different levels of analysis: individuals, teams, and organizations. Among the relevant questions is how the organizational context – such as its structure and culture – influences creativity of individuals and teams, and how creativity of individuals and teams leads to organizational innovation. The second is that it builds on the insight that creativity and innovation entail managing paradoxes or tensions. We will focus on three of these tensions.

The first tension is between freedom and pressure. As I said before, freedom in the form of autonomy, challenging work, and support has been found to stimulate creativity. At the same time, evidence indicates that putting people under pressure can enhance their creativity, because pressure increases the need to be creative. Freedom and pressure can operate at different levels of analysis. For example, organizations may face competitive pressure, teams may have to compete with other teams over scarce organizational resources, and individuals may face time pressure and deadlines. I believe that freedom and pressure can be combined and need not be mutually exclusive. For example, employees can more effectively deal with time pressure when they have
considerable autonomy to determine how to conduct their work. And I believe that pressure may lead to rigid responses and low creativity, but also that it increases the necessity to come up with creative ideas and to use them in innovations.

The second tension is between conflict and cooperation. We know from the literature that some degree of conflict can be highly stimulating: conflict exposes people to alternative points of view, and this can enhance their creativity. But within organizations, we know that cooperation is very important. How can we maintain the stimulating consequences of conflict, without undermining cooperation?

The third tension, from the organizational innovation literature, is between exploration and exploitation. Not all innovations are created equal. Some will be relatively incremental in scope, and are mainly aimed at improving efficiency or effectiveness of things that already exist: exploitative innovations. Others will be more radical, and are aimed at new customers or markets: explorative innovations. In the organizational strategy literature, it has been found that “ambidextrous organizations”, that combine exploration and exploitation, are more effective. However, because exploration requires a different mindset and different organizational structures than exploitation, they are very difficult to combine. We will examine how creativity of individuals and teams contributes to exploitative and explorative innovation, and under which conditions this is likely to happen. For example, organizations that are under considerable pressure may actually not become rigid, as is often assumed, but very open to explorative innovation. The consequence may be that radical ideas are more readily transformed into explorative innovation when a company is under pressure.

We will use different types of data to develop and test the new theory. We will use small-scale laboratory experiments to examine basic processes occurring at the individual or team level. To look at multi-level issues of how the organizational context influences the creativity of individuals and teams, and how creativity may translate into organizational innovation, we will use survey data from organizations. We therefore also plan a large data collection among organizations in the Northern Netherlands to look at these processes. This is going to be a real challenge, because we would ideally like to include perhaps 100 different companies and collect data throughout the whole organization, from the work floor to top management.”

Who will work with you in this project?
“On the broader topic of creativity and innovation, I have worked for a long time with colleagues and students. For example, Ramzi Said has defended his PhD dissertation this year and Yan Shao started her PhD project in September (see insets). With the Vici grant, I can appoint two additional PhD students and one or two postdocs. I have already hired a talented PhD student, Suqing Wu, who will complete her research master this summer, and I am currently advertising the other positions. The Vici project will be embedded in the Human Resource Management and Organizational Behavior programme (HRM/OB) and in the new signature area

Yan Shao

“I first read some of Bernard’s papers as a bachelor student in China and I was very inspired by his thoughts and insights in explaining the process of creativity. While doing my research master program at FEB, I had the good fortune to have him as my supervisor. In that programme, our first research project investigated creativity and ego-depletion, a psychological concept which has mostly been investigated in the context of ‘darker’ topics like impulsive eating, unsafe driving and aggressive behaviors. We propose that ego-depletion can enhance creativity if people can take the depleted state as an opportunity instead of a threat and we indeed found situations were ego-depleted people are more creative than non-depleted people.

I have now started my PhD research under his supervision and my project focuses on the tension that creative ideas of individuals need to be original, but also appropriate for the organization. I will investigate how individual characteristics and the organizational context influence this tension. This research fits well within Bernard’s Vici research and I feel thrilled and honored to be part of this research programme. During the past two and a half years, working with Bernard has been a very good experience for me, since he is both a respected researcher and also an inspiring supervisor who motivates students with constructive suggestions. What I learned from Bernard during my first project is his optimism when faced with unexpected difficulties and his flexibility in exploring alternatives given a problem. His unconditional support for my research and expertise in creativity research strongly strengthened my confidence and motivation to further pursue my academic career as a PhD student. Because I know that Bernard always provides me with a high degree of freedom to do what I am interested in, while always being there to motivate and help me with his expertise, I very much look forward to the coming years.”
Connecting Innovation and Creativity (CONINC). Within HRM/OB, colleagues like Onne Janssen, Floor Rink, and Gerben van der Vegt are also interested in issues around creativity and innovation. Within CONINC, I plan to work closely together with colleagues from Innovation, Management and Strategy (IMS), such as Dries Faems. In fact, the Vici project has had a head start, because it fits so well within the new signature area, and we can surely profit from colleagues at other departments."

**How will the project be useful more broadly?**

“Creativity and innovation are important to organizations. As we see too often, organizations that fail to innovate may easily disappear. I therefore think that a more integrated understanding of creativity in organizations, and how organizations may better use the creative potential of the workforce can be very valuable. This is true not only for organizations, but also for policy makers that wish to strengthen innovative performance in a region or a country. I see the Vici project as a collaboration with organizations in Northern Netherlands, in part as suppliers of data, but I would like to more broadly involve organizations in the different stages of the project, and keep them informed about project results. For example, we are planning to develop a website to keep organizations and policy makers involved, we will organize symposia, workshops, and a conference, and organizations that participate in the project will receive a personalized report. The project therefore is aimed at developing theory for practice.”

**Key publications**


**Ramzi Said**

“I currently work as a policy advisor at the Ministry of Finance and I have a part-time position as a teacher and project leader at FEB. I first met Bernard while being a research master student, and I wrote my thesis under his supervision. One thing led to another, and I became a PhD student with Bernard and Onne Janssen as supervisors, doing research on leadership and employee creativity. My research has shown that we have to rethink how leadership affects employee creativity. We examined how, why and when leadership relates to employee creative behaviors by going back to the essence of leadership: influencing employees through goal setting. The type of goals that leaders use to direct their employees is key. promotion goals related to gains, advancement and ideals may stimulate employee creativity, whereas prevention goals related to loss avoidance and stability may hamper employees’ creative actions.

We also examined the underlying processes that affect these relationships. So, in line with the research that Bernard is now going to conduct with his Vici grant, our past research showed how employees can best be managed within organizations in order to let them show creative behavior. Now it is time to bring this research even further by examining the consequences of creativity for organizations’ innovative capacity and economic profitability.

I got to know Bernard as inspiring researcher and supervisor. He was always available to answer my questions and, together with Onne Jansen and Tim Vriend, we had many great talks over dinner. Bernard is truly motivated to do academic research and teaching. His main strength lies in the fact that he looks at research problems in a different, creative way. Bernard once told me that he could not see himself doing any other type of work: this is what he wants to do. And I know first-hand that this is what he is good at.”
In the spotlight:
John Dong on slack resources
John Dong talks about this recent publication in the journal “Journal of Management”.

**What is the article about?**

“In this article, we examine how two types of slack resources (i.e., resources that are beyond necessity) – human resource slack and financial slack at the R&D functional level – influence the rent-generating potential of firm-specific knowledge. The resource-based view of the firm suggests that firm-specific knowledge can generate sustainable competitive advantage. In this study, however, we challenge this conventional wisdom by proposing that firm-specific knowledge does not automatically generate any rent unless knowledge employees are motivated to invest in specialized human capital that is specific to the firm. We theorize that human resource slack among knowledge employees reduces knowledge employees’ incentive to invest in firm-specific human capital whereas financial slack available for R&D enhances this incentive, because human capital slack among knowledge employees makes each employee less indispensable to the firm and financial slack for R&D foresters a favorable atmosphere for knowledge employees. Therefore, we argue that human resource slack strengthens the relationship between firm-specific knowledge and firm financial performance whereas financial slack weakens this relationship. By utilizing fine-grained measures for slack resources and firm-specific knowledge, we find empirical evidence from the U.S. top 100 R&D firms in 1997 to 2003 that corroborates our theory.”

**What is the scientific contribution?**

“We contribute to and extend the resource-based view of the firm in several ways. First, our study helps delimiting its applicability by demonstrating contingencies that either enhance or depreciate the value of firm-specific knowledge. The traditional resource-based view of the firm primarily focused on a firm’s core resources and the criteria making these resources the sources of sustainable competitive advantage, and often overlooked the role of employees’ incentive in deploying the core resources that contribute to sustainable competitive advantage. Our study reminds us that a more holistic picture explaining firm heterogeneity in financial performance requires consideration of both core resources and employees’ incentive to deploy them. Second, our study shows the interconnectedness of various resources. Our findings demonstrate that the value of firm-specific knowledge resources – a key source of sustainable competitive advantage – may be enhanced or impaired by the presence of slack resources that are relevant to knowledge employees’ incentive.

This paper also enriches the literature on organizational slack in several aspects. First, while prior work has focused mainly on the direct impacts of slack resources on firm performance, we shift the attention to the nuanced role of slack resources in changing employees’ incentive and increase or decrease the rent-generating potential of other resources. Second, we elucidate the distinction between human resource slack and financial slack, and demonstrate that human resource slack and financial slack have opposite influences on employee’s incentive and the performance impact of firm-specific knowledge.”

**What is the societal relevance of this research?**

“This article provides important implications for managers: employees’ incentive matters for building sustainable competitive advantage. Accumulation of core resources is one thing, while how employees deploy these resources is entirely another issue. Firm-specific knowledge has great potential to generate economic rent, which can be realized only when knowledge employees are willing to invest in firm-specific human capital. Our findings also remind managers that slack can be either a facilitator or inhibitor for firm-specific knowledge realizing its rent-generating potential. In particular, managers should bear in mind that too much is as bad as too little when it comes to the recruitment of knowledge employees.”

**Who is John Dong?**

“I am an assistant professor of strategy and organization in the Department of Innovation Management and Strategy. I obtained my PhD in information systems from the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology in 2014. In 2015, my PhD thesis won the best paper award (1st runner-up) from the Organizational Communication and Information Systems (OCIS) Division at the Academy of Management. My research interests focus on innovation management in a broad sense, including collaborative innovation, digital innovation, firm-specific knowledge and organizational learning. My current research investigates the collaborative innovation between a focal firm and its partners and customers, especially in a digitally-enabled manner. Moreover, I study the rent generation of firm-specific knowledge and organizational learning in innovation decisions.”

In the past months, several FEB researchers have been appointed to various positions and grants were obtained.

### Appointments

**Herman de Jong new Dean of FEB as of 1 September**
Professor Herman de Jong has been appointed by the Board of the University as the new Dean of FEB, starting 1 September 2016 for the period of four years. De Jong (1958) is Professor of Economic History. He studied economic and social history in Groningen, and after graduating he worked for a number of years as a researcher for Shell. He then became a lecturer at FEB and in 1999 he gained his PhD. After being Associate Professor he became professor of Economic History in 2012. Between 2004 and 2009 De Jong served as a scientific director of the N.W. Posthumus Institute, an interuniversity graduate school for economic and social history. In 2013 he received a prestigious Vici grant of NWO and in 2012 he was voted Lecturer of the Year at FEB.

**Koert van Ittersum director within Dutch top sector Agri & Food**
FEB researcher Koert van Ittersum has been appointed as director of fundamental research on consumer & supply chain within the Dutch top sector Agri & Food. This top sector stimulates the development of new knowledge and innovations about food. In order to achieve this goal, Agri & Food set out nine roadmaps that clarify this path to innovation. The roadmap ‘consumer & supply chain’ focuses on the ways in which the communication between the food sector and the society and consumer can be strengthened.

**Janka Stoker appointed to external evaluation commission DNB and AFM**
Janka Stoker has been appointed by De Nederlandsche Bank (DNB) and the Netherlands Authority for Financial Markets (AFM) to the external commission which is going to evaluate the testing policy of both supervisory bodies. The other members of the commission are Annetje Ottow (Utrecht University) and Jan Hommen (Koninklijke Ahold N.V.).
Grants

Vidi research grant for Floor Rink
Floor Rink has been awarded a Vidi research grant of 800,000 euro by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research NWO for her research project “The scrutiny of top administrators: internal or external?” These days, the decision making of top administrators is under close scrutiny. Often, however, this scrutiny does not produce the desired results, raising the question of who is most influential with administrators: internal or external supervisors?

2.6 million euro grant for centre of expertise CIBIF
Together with a group of researchers from universities in the UK, Canada, US and Ghana and the African Economic Research Consortium, FEB researchers Robert Lensink, Niels Hermes and Shubhashis Gangopadhyay of the Center for International Banking, Insurance and Finance (CIBIF) have been awarded a grant worth 2.61 million euro from the British DFID-ESRC Growth Research programme. The grant will be used to do research on developing policies to help make the financial sector an effective instrument in promoting financial inclusion and sustained growth in low-income countries. The research project will be carried out over a four-year period.

Korea Foundation Grant for CEASG and FEB
The Centre for East Asian Studies Groningen and FEB have successfully applied with the Korea Foundation for a grant of 300,000 USD to further develop Korean Studies at the University of Groningen. The grant allows the continuation of the tenure track appointment of Dr. Sunkung Choi at FEB, with affiliation to GSG/CEASG. Choi conducts research on experimental economics.

European Investment Bank Grant for Dries Faems and Isabel Estrada
Dries Faems and Isabel Estrada have received a 300,000 euro grant from the European Investment Bank, together with colleagues from Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna (Institute of Management) and KU Leuven (Research Division INCENTIM). They received the grant to conduct research on the topic “How can larger organisations also be innovative organisations?”

Funding for research project of Pedro de Faria
Pedro de Faria has received 100,000 euro from the Francisco Manuel dos Santos foundation to investigate the effects of closure of foreign multinational companies in Portugal. In a two-year project, the researchers aim to uncover how the Portuguese economy deals with the human capital that becomes available after the subsidiaries of the foreign multinational company closes down.

Awards & Prizes

Duisenberg Prize for Robert Inklaar
Robert Inklaar has been awarded the Willem F. Duisenberg Fellowship Prize 2016 for his outstanding and original research into applied macroeconomics. Inklaar studies the development of economic growth and the role that the financial sector plays in this process. He was presented with his prize, comprising a medal and 15,000 euro, by head of the jury Klaas Knot, Director of De Nederlandsche Bank, and Victor Halberstadt, Chair of the Willem F. Duisenberg Foundation. The jury praised the creativity and extraordinary quality of Inklaar’s work.

European Journal of Marketing Best Paper Award for Tammo Bijnolit
FEB researcher Tammo Bijmolt, together with Valentina Melnyk of Massey University (New Zealand), has won the Best Paper Award of the European Journal of Marketing of 2015, with the article titled: “The effects of introducing and terminating loyalty programs”. Bijmolt and Melnyk found that loyalty program introduction has a substantial impact on customer behavior. However, they also showed that terminating a loyalty program can lower customer purchases considerably.

Damien Power receives GLOBE Robert J. House Best Research Paper Award
Together with three co-authors, FEB researcher Damien Power has been awarded the prestigious international award for the best research paper on global leadership and/or cross-cultural research. The article was published in the journal Management Science. The award consists of a 2,500 USD cash prize. Power's co-authors are Rob Klassen (Ivey Business School), Tom Kull (Arizona State) and Dayna Simpson (Monash).

Outstanding Practical Implications Paper Award for DeGeest, De Vries and Van der Vegt
FEB researchers David DeGeest, Thom de Vries and Gerben van der Vegt won the Outstanding Practical Implications Paper Award of the Organizational Behavior Division of the Academy of Management for their paper on collaboration between teams. The researchers discovered that, in order for collaboration between teams to be effective, managers of teams should make the team aware of the skills and abilities within the team and their relationship with other teams. In their paper titled “The Promise and Peril of Boundary Spanning for Team Outcomes: A Resource Allocation Perspective” the researchers monitored the performance of 72 cross-functional teams in a healthcare organization.

Third Prize EMAC McKinsey Marketing Dissertation Award for Lisette de Vries
Lisette de Vries has won the third prize of the EMAC McKinsey Marketing Dissertation Award. She has been one of the three finalists out of 52 potential candidates. Lisette defended her dissertation in 2015 and the thesis has been supervised by FEB researcher Peter Leeflang and Sonja Gensler (University of Münster).
Publications

Please find below an overview of publications in SOM’s top and very good journals, PhD thesis and reports in the working paper series in the period December 2015-June 2016.


**PhD theses**

**Emanuel Barnea**
Monetary Policy and Financial Stability in a Banking Economy: Transmission Mechanism and the Capital Markets  
Supervisors: Prof. K.F. Roszbach & Prof. B.W. Lensink  
Defended on December 21, 2015

**Sander Beckers**
Going beyond Transactions: Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Studies on Customer Engagement Behavior Effectiveness  
Supervisors: Prof. P.C. Verhoef & Dr. J. van Doorn  
Defended on January 21, 2016

**Thinus Bekker**
Digital Governance in Support of Infrastructure Asset Management  
Supervisor: Prof. H.G. Sol  
Defended on March 24, 2016

**Brenda Bos**
Creating Value from Alliance Portfolios: Connecting Internal Structures and External Knowledge Recombination  
Supervisors: Prof. D.L.M. Faems & Dr. F. Noseleit  
Defended on April 28, 2016

**Francesco Chiaravalloti**
Performance Evaluation in the Arts: From the Margins of Accounting to the Core of Accountability  
Supervisors: Prof. J. van der Meer-Kooistra, Prof. R.W. Scapens & Dr. C.M. Vuyk  
Defended on April 18, 2016

**Evert de Haan**
Creating, Managing and Monitoring Customer Value in the On- and Offline World  
Supervisors: Prof. P.C. Verhoef & Prof. T. Wiesel  
Defended on January 25, 2016

**Solmaria Halleck Vega**
Cross-sectional Dependence and Regional Labor Market Dynamics  
Supervisor: Prof. J.P. Elhorst  
Defended on January 7, 2016

**Gerlach van der Heide**
Inventory Control for Multi-location Rental Systems  
Supervisors: Prof. K.J. Roodbergen & Dr. N.D. van Foreest  
Defended on February 1, 2016

**Proscovia Katumba**
A Decision Enhancement Studio for Water Asset Management  
Supervisors: Prof. H.G. Sol & Prof. J. Lubega  
Defended on March 3, 2016

**Berend van der Kolk**
Management Control Packages in Public Sector Organizations  
Supervisors: Prof. P.M.G. van Veen-Dirks & Prof. H.J. ter Bogt  
Defended on May 28, 2016

**Arnold Mulder**
CO₂ Emissions Trading in the EU: Models and Policy Applications  
Supervisors: Prof. C.J. Jepma, Prof. S. Brakman & Prof. H.W.A. Dietzenbacher  
Defended on February 4, 2016

**Raun van Ooijen**
Life Cycle Behavior under Uncertainty: Essays on Savings, Mortgages and Health  
Supervisors: Prof. R.J.M. Alessie & Dr. A.S. Kalwij  
Defended on January 21, 2016

**Ramzi Said**
Rethinking the Leadership-Employee Creativity Relationship: A Regulatory Focus Approach  
Supervisors: Prof. B.A. Nijstad & Prof. O. Janssen  
Defended on February 15, 2016

**Wim Siekman**
Search and Switching Costs  
Supervisors: Prof. R.J.M. Alessie & Dr. M.A. Haan  
Defended on April 14, 2016

**Tim Vriend**
Unethically Motivated: How Management Tools Elicit Functional Unethical Behaviors  
Supervisors: Prof. O. Janssen & Dr. J. Jordan  
Defended on February 22, 2016

**Rasmus Wiese**
Supervisors: Prof. J. de Haan & Dr. R.M. Jong A Pin  
Defended on March 24, 2016
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